

REMARKS

Claims 30 and 31 have been amended to clarify the scope of the pending claims. Claims 81 and 82 have been allowed. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims 30, 31, 81, and 82 are consistent with the claims the Examiner deemed allowable, and are now in condition for allowance. Claims 72 and 100 have been amended. Claims 33, 38, 42, 46, 85, 87, 90, and 92 have been canceled. Claims 32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, 51, 56-57, 69-73 and 79 depend from claim 30. Claims 84, 86, 88-89, 91, and 93-102 depend from claim 31. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification. No new matter has been added. Claims 30-32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, 51, 56-57, 69-73, 79, 81-82, 84, 86, 88-89, 91, and 92-102 are pending.

Applicants believe that claim 72 and 100 comply with 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 72 and 100 refer to a liquid stereolithography resin wherein the photoinitiator includes a component selected from the group consisting of -2,4,6-trimethylbenzoyl-diphenyl-phosphineoxide and hydroxy-2-methyl-1-phenyl-propan-1-one, a phosphine oxide, and a 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-phenyl-1-propanone, or mixtures thereof.

Previously Withdrawn Claims

Previously withdrawn claims 32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, and 51 have been amended to depend from an elected species (Claim 30). Claims 30-32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, 51, 56-57, 69-73, 79, 81-82, 84, 86, 88-89, 91, and 92-102 read on the elected species.

Objections

Claims 30-31, and 81-82 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (see page 13 of the Office Action of March 2, 2006). However, the Examiner indicated that claims 30-31 and 81-82 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (see page 13 of Office Action of March 2, 2006). Claims 30-31 and 81-82 have been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of this objection.

Rejections

Claims 5 and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention (see page 12 of the Office Action).

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10-12, 15-21, 56-57 and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lin et al. U.S. Patent 6,420,451, as evidenced by Sartomer Application Bulletin and Sartomer (Low Toxicity...) and Sartomer Technical Data Sheet: CN962 and Sartomer Technical Data Sheet: CN 964 (see page 4 of the Office Action).

Claims 68-69, 71-76, and 78-79 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ojeda et al. U.S. Patent 6,326,072 (see page 5 of the Office Action).

Claims 1-2, 4-10, 18-21, 27-28, 68-69, 71-76, 78 and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abel et al. WO 01/98817 A2, as evidenced by Fitz Chem Corp (PRIPLAST polyester polyols derived from dimerized fatty acids) and Priplast tm 34192 and OSHA (see page 8 of the Office Action).

Claims 1-10, 18-21, 26-28, 68-76, 78-79 and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abel et al. WO 01/98817 A2 as evidenced by Fitz Chem Corp (PRIPLAST polyester polyols derived from dimerized fatty acids) and Priplast tm 34192 and OSHA, in further view of Baudin et al. WO 02/48202 A1 (see page 11 of the Office Action).

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 18-21, 23-24, 26 and 56-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yamazaki et al. EP 0 874 012 A1 (see page 12 of the Office Action).

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 10, and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Morris et al. EP 0 745 570 A2 (see page 13 of the Office Action).

Applicants continue to disagree with these grounds of rejection. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-29, 33-36, 38, 41, 42, 44-46, 48-50, 52-55, 58-68, 74-78, 80, 83, 85, 87, 90, and 92 without prejudice. In addition, claims 32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, 51, 56-57, 69-73 and 79 have been amended to depend from claim 30, which has been deemed allowable (see page 13 of the Office Action of March 2, 2006).

Claims 84, 86, 88-89, 91, and 93-102 depend from claim 31, which has been deemed allowable (see page 13 of the Office Action). The subject matter of claims 84-102 is

Applicant: Alma L. Coats et al.
Application No.: 10/628,304
Filing Date: July 29, 2003
Page 14 of 14

Attorney Docket No.: 14974.0002

commensurate the subject matter of claims 32, 37, 39, 40, 43, 47, 51, 56-57, 69-73 and 79.

Accordingly, claim 31 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable over the references of record.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 30-31, and 81-82, and the claims that depend therefrom are in condition for allowance and request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all requirements of patentability are met in the pending claims. Allowance of the claims is thereby respectfully solicited. Please apply any deposits or credits to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Charge No. 14974.0002).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-11-06



Harold H. Fox
Reg. No. 41,498

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Phone: 202-429-3000
Fax: 202-429-3902